

Because of the above, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the above noted rejection.

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McConnell in view of Herzenberg. The examiner has discussed McConnell above with regard to claim 1. It has been established above that no "knob" has been claimed in claim 1. By rejecting claim 2 the examiner relies on statements made in rejecting claim 1. The free end 36 of McConnell is not a knob in the sense that the knob and the basic key reader have an identical color thereon as is claimed. The end of the key reader of McConnell is merely a thickened portion and has nothing to do with any color identification. Therefore, McConnell cannot qualify as a basic reference that can be modified by Herzenberg. Herzenberg merely has multiple keys aligned with each other in one block of keys. The keys are to be of different colors to be identifiable with different projects. This is not what applicant is claiming. Applicant is claiming that the knob (not present in McConnell) and the basic key reader have an identical color thereon. A multiple of keys having different colors does not qualify for this recitation and cannot be used to modify a basic reference.

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McConnell in view of Naill and further view of Heridia. McConnell has been discussed supra and cannot qualify as a basic reference. It is to be noted that claim 3 does not recite a knob and therefore, the examiner's comments regarding a "knob" are not understood and are confusing. The secondary reference to Naill has movable levers 82 to 90 which indicate the position of the decoders 70 to 76. The decoding is effected by shifting the decoders separately. It is not known how the examiner can state "that to record the information of vehicles used with the basic key reader of McConnell on cards in view of the respective teachings of Naill and Heridia". The motivation (according to the examiner) is being to provide a directory for convenient access of information for specific locks. The applicant insists that this

motivation does not flow from the references cited. The applicant insists that a person having ordinary skill in this art and having the three references in front of him/her would not be able to write claim 3 in its present form. The examiner is gleaning the motivation from applicant's specification which cannot be used to negate patentability. The examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejection of claims 1 to 3 based on the arguments and facts provided above.



Steven G. Mathena

Date: X 9-24-04